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This topic moves the focus on from subcultures (some of which operate within localized space) to the:

urban/city/metropolitan context

The aim is to examine the place of physical culture within the contemporary, NEOLIBERAL CITY.
From 1920 onwards, American has been an URBAN NATION, meaning for the first time the majority of its population lived in cities/metropolitan areas (51.2% urban/48.8% rural).

In the 2010 census, the American population was split between 80.7% living in URBAN areas, and 19.3% living in RURAL areas.

Hence, it is important to consider the place, structure, and influence of sport and physical culture in the contemporary city.
Baltimore’s Physical Culture
Theme 1:

Baltimore as the Archetypal Neoliberal City
Baltimore is “In many ways…emblematic of the processes that have moulded cities under US capitalism, offering a laboratory sample of contemporary urbanism.”

Post-War (1945) Economic and Social Changes in American Cities

DEPOPULATION:
The movement of large portions of the URBAN population to expanding SUBURBAN communities

DEINDUSTRIALIZATION:
The decline of traditional, city-based and large-scale workforce, MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.
Baltimore City Population, 1790-2010

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Since 1950s, Baltimore City’s Population Declined; Surrounding Five Counties’ Population Rose

1950: 949,708
2010: 620,961

This is the process of URBAN DEPOPULATION.

Source: Bureau of the Census.

As with many other rustbelt cities, Baltimore’s industrial manufacturing base—which had been at the heart of the city’s economy—entered a steep decline in the decades following the end of WWII.

This is the process of URBAN DEINDUSTRIALIZATION.

Baltimore’s DEPOPULATION and related DEINDUSTRIALIZATION has led to a steep decline in the city’s TAX BASE.

TAX BASE: The tax dollars derived from city RESIDENTS and BUSINESSES which provide much of the BUDGET for the OPERATING of CITY SERVICES and PROGRAMS.
The Economic/Political Evolution of Baltimore

**Industrial Baltimore**

- Decline in/Relocation of Mass Manufacturing
- Deindustrializing City
  - Declining Urban Population
  - Shrinking Urban Workforce
  - Diminishing Urban Tax Base
- REDUCED CITY REVENUES AND BUDGETS
- Public Service Retrenchment and Commercial Privatization
- Post-Industrial/Neo-Liberal Baltimore

**Post-Industrial/Neo-Liberal Baltimore**
The Core Tenets of Neoliberalism

1. Don’t waste public money on social welfare/“social engineering” programs: government retrenchment

2. Provide more money to individuals through lessening the tax burden

3. Develop corporate/business-friendly (anti-union/deregulated) climate to stimulate economic growth through “trickle down economics”

4. Encourage the commercial privatization of all aspects of society

5. Let the “free market” become the regulator of economic and social development

6. Provide productive individuals with increased freedom and opportunity to cultivate their own lives
Post-Industrial Baltimore’s Neoliberal Shift

Welfare Managerial City Governance

Public Service

Baltimore City

Entrepreneurial City Governance

Private Capital
Historically, city governments and administrations were focused on providing services and facilities for the city populace.
The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Privatization/Reduction of Public Services and Spaces

Education Services
Sanitation Services
Police Services
Library Services
Recreation Services
Fire Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance Objective</td>
<td>Public Welfare</td>
<td>Capital Profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Increasingly Private Outsourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sites of Governance</td>
<td>Public Spaces and Services</td>
<td>Commercial Spaces and Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Neoliberalism and the Rise of the Entrepreneurial City

There has been a shift away from managerial welfare to entrepreneurially based city governance.

A move away from welfare to commercial oriented objectives.

And, a replacement of the citizen with the consumer as the focal point of urban leadership.

Many urban authorities seem now more interested in providing consumption spaces/opportunities rather than public services.
The Trickle Down Philosophy of Entrepreneurial City Governance

PUBLICLY FUNDED Business Subsidies and Tax Breaks STIMULATES the Growth of the COMMERCIAL SECTOR within cities

Creation of JOBS, Growth in CONSUMPTION LEVELS, Increases in CORPORATE and SALES TAXES

Contribution to PERSONAL INCOMES

Contribution to CITY FINANCES and OPERATIONAL BUDGET
Cities of Consumption

“Once cities prospered as places of industrial production, and in the industrial era they were engines of growth and prosperity. On the eve of the twenty first century, they are becoming spaces for consumption in a global economy where services provide the impetus for expansion”

(Fainstein & Judd, 1999,p. 2)

Within the post-industrial/entrepreneurial city, CONSUMPTION SPACES/EXPERIENCES are positioned as a key:

**MOTOR/ENGINE of ECONOMIC GROWTH**

From, in a truly NEOLIBERAL sense, it is anticipated that capital will TRICKLE-DOWN to city RESIDENTS (in the form of employment) and TRICKLE-UP to city GOVERNMENT (in the form of commercial taxes).
Core Components of the Re-Invented Post-Industrial City

**Retail Spaces** (shopping sites)
- Forum Des Halles
  - Paris, France

**Sport Spaces** (spectacle sites)
- Staples Center
  - Los Angeles, USA

**Festival Spaces** (performance sites)
- Eau Claire Festival Market
  - Calgary, Canada

**Leisure Spaces** (entertainment sites)
- G-Mex Venue
  - Manchester, England

**Hotel Spaces** (accommodation sites)
- Bonaventure Hotel
  - Los Angeles, USA

**Heritage Spaces** (cultural sites)
- National Civil Rights Museum
  - Memphis, USA
Through tax-payer funded corporate subsidies and commercially-focused initiatives, NEOLIBERAL city governments look to create spectacular “TOURIST BUBBLES” (Judd, 1999, p. 53), designed to attract the discretionary leisure income of:

Out of Town Tourists $$ + Suburban Tourists $$

The “tourist bubble”, Judd (1999, p. 39) suggests:

“is like a theme park ... [with] standardized venues ... mass produced, almost as if they are made in a tourism infrastructure factory”.

Theme 2:

Baltimore’s Spectacular Reinvention and Corporate Sport
The Reinvented POST-INDUSTRIAL CITY

“deindustrialization and economic restructuring have left many cities in what used to be the affluent West with few options other than competing with each other to be centers of shopping and entertainment”

Industrial Baltimore

Centre of Industrial Production

Post-Industrial Baltimore

Centre of Cultural Consumption
Demise of Urban Based Industrial Production

Movement of Jobs and Population to Suburbs

Decline of Urban Population, Wealth, and Tax Base

New Forms of Urban Regeneration and Capital Accumulation

City Becomes a Consumption/Service Zone
The “Greater Baltimore City” Vision

Originated in the 1950s, by Mayor William Donald Schaefer and associates.

Focused on publicly subsidized commercial, entertainment, and tourist projects designed to create a vibrant and economically productive post-industrial Baltimore.
Baltimore’s Spectacular Redevelopment: Phase I

“the model for post-industrial waterfront redevelopment around the world.”

The Publicly Subsidized Creation of Post-Industrial Baltimore

- **Retail Spaces** (shopping sites)
  - The Gallery

- **Sport Spaces** (spectacle sites)
  - Oriole Park at Camden Yards

- **Festival Spaces** (performance sites)
  - Harbor Place Amphitheater

- **Leisure Spaces** (entertainment sites)
  - Power Plant Live!

- **Hotel Spaces** (accommodation sites)
  - Hilton Hotel

- **Heritage Spaces** (cultural sites)
  - National Aquarium
Baltimore’s “Tourist Bubble”
Service and Entertainment Core

Tangible Benefits (according to the Maryland Stadium Authority):

i. National/international recognition  
ii. 70 buildings constructed  
iii. 30,000 Jobs  
iv. $2 billion of investment in downtown Baltimore
Post-Industrial Baltimore’s “Tourist Bubble”
Being a “Major League” city:

“SPORT has become an important part of the way in which cities have attempted to create, espouse and transmit images of the city as a reinvigorated centre of spectacle, pleasure and play”

Mission:

• To plan, finance, build and manage sports and entertainment facilities in Maryland.

• Provide enjoyment, enrichment, education, and business opportunities for citizens.

• Develop partnerships with local governments, universities, private enterprise, and the community.

“ Its mandate includes creating public-private partnerships for financing and operating facilities.”

Source: Maryland Stadium Authority: www.mdstad.com/the-mission-and-vision-statement
Maryland Stadium Authority (MSA): Baltimore Projects

M&T Bank Stadium

Baltimore Convention Center

Orioles Park at Camden Yards

Hippodrome Performing Arts Center
Baltimore’s Publicly Subsidized Stadia/Teams

Oriole Park at Camden Yards

Total Public Funding/Subsidy: $208.6 million
Sources of Public Funding: State funds
Main Tenants: Baltimore Orioles

M&T Bank Stadium

Total Public Funding/Subsidy: $414 million
Sources of Public Funding: State revenue bonds, State lottery funds, Stadium Authority Revenues
Main Tenants: Baltimore Ravens
Deindustrializing Baltimore


Oriole Park Subsidies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Subsidies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50% of Land Acquisition and Site Preparation</td>
<td>$44.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>97.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train infrastructure</td>
<td>18.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>48.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Station</td>
<td>0.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Subsidies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208.6 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deindustrializing Baltimore

## Sources of NFL Stadium Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadium/Team</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Year Opened</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Private Funding</th>
<th>Public Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco 49ers (Proposed)</td>
<td>San Francisco 49ers</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$987.0</td>
<td>$873.0 88%</td>
<td>$114.0 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetLife Stadium</td>
<td>Giants/Jets</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,600.0</td>
<td>$1,600.0 100%</td>
<td>$0.0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowboys Stadium</td>
<td>Dallas Cowboys</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,194.0</td>
<td>$750.0 63%</td>
<td>$444.0 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas Oil Stadium</td>
<td>Indianapolis Colts</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$719.6</td>
<td>$100.0 14%</td>
<td>$619.6 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix Stadium</td>
<td>Arizona Cardinals</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$455.0</td>
<td>$147.0 32%</td>
<td>$308.0 68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Financial Field</td>
<td>Philadelphia Eagles</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$518.0</td>
<td>$330.0 64%</td>
<td>$188.0 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Field (renovation)</td>
<td>Chicago Bears</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$587.0</td>
<td>$200.0 34%</td>
<td>$387.0 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeau Field (renovation)</td>
<td>Green Bay Packers</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$295.2</td>
<td>$126.1 43%</td>
<td>$169.1 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillette Stadium</td>
<td>New England Patriots</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$412.0</td>
<td>$340.0 83%</td>
<td>$72.0 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Field</td>
<td>Detroit Lions</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$440.0</td>
<td>$330.0 75%</td>
<td>$110.0 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant Stadium</td>
<td>Houston Texans</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$474.0</td>
<td>$185.0 39%</td>
<td>$289.0 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CenturyLink Field</td>
<td>Seattle Seahawks</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$461.3</td>
<td>$161.0 35%</td>
<td>$300.3 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz Field</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Steelers</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$280.8</td>
<td>$109.2 39%</td>
<td>$171.6 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Authority Field at Mile High</td>
<td>Denver Broncos</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$400.8</td>
<td>$111.8 28%</td>
<td>$289.0 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Brown Stadium</td>
<td>Cincinnati Bengals</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$449.8</td>
<td>$25.0 6%</td>
<td>$424.8 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP Field</td>
<td>Tennessee Titans</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$291.7</td>
<td>$84.8 29%</td>
<td>$206.9 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Browns Stadium</td>
<td>Cleveland Browns</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$271.0</td>
<td>$71.0 26%</td>
<td>$200.0 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;T Bank Stadium</td>
<td>Baltimore Ravens</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$226.0</td>
<td>$22.4 10%</td>
<td>$203.6 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond James Stadium</td>
<td>Tampa Bay Buccaneers</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$194.0</td>
<td>$0.0 0%</td>
<td>$194.0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx Field</td>
<td>Washington Redskins</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$250.5</td>
<td>$180.0 72%</td>
<td>$70.5 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**: $525.4 (Total Project Cost), $287.3 (Total Private Funding), $238.1 (Total Public Funding), 44% (Total Private Funding), 56% (Total Public Funding).
Theme 3:

Feeding the Downtown “Sporting” Monster
According to cultural geographer David Harvey (2001), in re-developed cities such as Baltimore, continual public investment is needed to perpetually UPGRADE the DOWNTOWN AMENITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE in order to keep it COMPETITIVE WITH RIVAL CITIES.

RIVAL CITIES VYING FOR the same:

- business investment
- tourist dollars
- new residents
“Feeding the downtown monster” (Harvey, 2001, p. 141): a monster which is never satisfied due to the need for continual REDEVELOPMENT and UPGRADING in order to remain competitive.

Feeding the Downtown Monster

“The Baltimore City government has spent $2 billion in building and maintaining Baltimore’s tourist facilities since the 1970s, and hundreds of millions more in subsidies to tourism-related businesses. These cost demands continue and will always remain high, because to MAINTAIN ITSELF AS A TOURIST DESTINATION, Baltimore must constantly add something new. For example, in December 2005, the city announced an expansion to the famous Aquarium featured at its Inner Harbor tourist center.”

There is also a perceived need to continually Feed the Downtown SPORTING Monster.

There is INTENSE COMPETITION between post-industrial cities vying to be a MAJOR LEAGUE city, and hopefully attract business investment, tourist dollars, and new residents.

POST-INDUSTRIAL INTER-URBAN COMPETITION
Feeding the Downtown SPORTING Monster

Involves CITY government’s providing PUBLICLY-FUNDED:

1. Tax and Business Subsidies to attract the team or event to the city/ensure it remains there

2. Building facilities to attract the team or event to the city/ensure it remains there
Why do local governments/politicians place so much emphasis on attracting and retaining “major league” sport?

If you “lose” a team to a COMPETING CITY:

“Politicians continue to believe that it would be political disaster to lose a team on their watch.”

In Baltimore’s case, the established nature of the Orioles and Ravens means that FEEDING THE DOWNTOWN SPORTING MONSTER requires developing new sporting events/attractions/facilities designed to further the city’s CULTURAL and COMMERCIAL appeal.
The Baltimore Grand Prix (2011-?) as Neoliberal “Game Changer”

Indy Car Series/American Le Man Series Race

“When the race was announced in June 2010, Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake claimed it would be a “game changer”, impacting both the city’s declining economic fortunes and the negative perception of the city held by potential visitors.”

Neoliberal Governance and the Baltimore Grand Prix
Neoliberal City Politics and Sporting Spectacle

“The naysayers certainly had their day…until the race started…Anytime you do something big you take a risk…I had the opportunity to let Baltimore shine.”

Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake
Mayoral Election Day: September 13

Benefiting Baltimore Citizens?
Trickle-Down Grand Prix Racing?

Costs to City:
$7.7 million (approx)
(roadwork, police, clean-up etc.)

Projected Returns:
$70-$100 million
(tax revenue, extra jobs, related spending)

Actual Returns:
City did not recover capital cost investment

Once supportive, the ECONOMIC failure of the BGP prompted Baltimore City council president, Jack Young, to call for it to be dropped:

“I initially supported the Grand Prix because I thought it would be worthwhile and because from time to time cities need to explore fresh ideas to generate revenue and attract visitors. But to continue to pursue the race, which has incurred a large amount debt, is not the best option at a time when so many other important programs and services lack much-needed support.”

The Next Big Thing?

Baltimore Convention Center and Arena Redevelopment
Recognising Inter-Urban Competition and the Need to “Feed the Downtown Monster”
There is considerable evidence to suggest that the financial impact of professional sport events/teams/stadia on CITY ECONOMIES in general is at best NEGLIGIBLE.

While investors/owners may benefit, there is little evidence of an economic TRICKLE DOWN EFFECT when it comes to sport events/teams/stadia.

Numerous researchers have identified little or no added benefit to CITY ECONOMIES:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE APPROACH TO SPORT FOCUSED URBAN REGENERATION STRATEGIES</th>
<th>NEGATIVE APPROACH TO SPORT FOCUSED URBAN REGENERATION STRATEGIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job creation within sectors directly and indirectly related to the event/team/stadium</td>
<td>1. The majority of jobs are low-paid, hourly/seasonal, and lack benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tax boost to local government from the profits of to the event/team/stadium</td>
<td>2. Publicly funded subsidies/tax concessions to owners often negate potential tax revenue generated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increased consumer spending, business profits, and related tax generation within local economy</td>
<td>3. Research suggests very little NEW spending is created, such events draw consumption from other sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure improvements to the city</td>
<td>4. Many improvements specific to facility/venue, with little wider benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY:** SPORT EVENT/TEAM/STADIUM AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTOR TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY

**SUMMARY:** SPORT EVENT/TEAM/STADIUM A QUESTIONNABLE CONTRIBUTOR TO THE LOCAL ECONOMY
As Frank Rashid, co-founder of the Tiger Stadium Fan Club noted:

“Public subsidies for stadiums are a great deal for team owners, league executives, developers, bond attorneys, construction firms, politicians and everyone in the stadium food chain, but a really terrible deal for everyone else.”

SYMBOLOC (POLITICAL) AS OPPOSED TO REAL (ECONOMIC) BENEFITS?

Ravens Fans: Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake and Governor Martin O’Malley

According to Allen Sanderson, the University of Chicago economist:

“If you want to inject money into the local economy, it would be better to drop it from a helicopter than invest it in a new ballpark”

An economic success story?

Both Orioles Park at Camden Yards and Raven’s Stadium generate considerably less from jobs and out-of-state resident spending than their costs to taxpayers in inflation adjusted INTEREST (on initial building costs) and DEPRECIATION (of facilities).

Cost to Maryland tax payer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadium</th>
<th>Cost (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriole Park at Camden Yards</td>
<td>$14 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;T Bank Stadium</td>
<td>$18 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 4:

Neoliberal Baltimore’s Privileged Spaces (and Populations)
The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

- Education Services
- Sanitation Services
- Police Services
- Library Services
- Recreation Services
- Fire Services

Privatization/Reduction of Public Services and Spaces
NEOLIBERALISM and the IDEOLOGY of INDIVIDUALISM

The neoliberal urban order providing individuals with opportunities in the consumer marketplace.
1. Public Provision

Based on idea that access to physical activity, health, and wellness is a civil right, and there should be free and equal access to physical activity resources and opportunities to all citizens.

2. Market Provision

Based on idea that freedom of choice is best served through the free market where individuals can choose, and pay for, their own activity/health related practices.
The dominance of the privatized physical activity marketplace has created:

“a dominant mode of consumption in which the majority will satisfy most of its [physical activity] consumption through private purchase…” (p. 318).

Three Neoliberal Baltimores

Physical Culture and the *Renaissance City*

The postindustrial redevelopment/regeneration or RENAISSANCE of cities focuses on policies designed to attract the RIGHT (particularly in terms of economics/consumer power) population into cities.

Most highly prized are what Richard Florida (2002) dubbed the “creative class”.

The [Economic] Rise and Importance of the Creative Class

- Number of workers, by decade
- Percentage of workforce, by decade
- Percentage of workforce vs. percentage of wages paid in 2006

© 2008 Richard Florida www.whosyourcity.com

SOURCE: KEVIN STOLARICK; GRAPHIC BY RYAN MORRIS
According to Florida (2002), the creative class is another important \textbf{MOTOR of the ECONOMY} within the post-industrial city, both in terms of the new technologically-based industries they work in, and in the experientially oriented and consumption-based lifestyles they create for themselves.

Living in the \textit{right urban environment} (diverse, eclectic, dynamic, stimulating), is a key feature of the experiential existence desired by the creative class.
The very idea of the CREATIVE CLASS has had a significant influence in shaping housing, commercial, and urban development strategies and initiatives, all designed to reinvent the city as a place that would attract this desired population.

GENTRIFICATION: Redevelopment of previously poor and/or industrial neighborhoods into attractive (to the creative class) commercial and residential spaces: DISPLACEMENT of poorer populations for the more affluent.
STALKING THE CREATIVE CLASS
It is also about encouraging appropriate LEISURE services and experiences for the creative class to attract them and keep them in the urban core.

“The ideal (for the creative class) is to ‘live the life’ – a creative life packed-full of intense, high-quality, multidimensional experiences. And the kinds of experiences they crave for reflect and reinforce their identities as creative people .... They favour active, participatory recreation over passive spectator sports. They like indigenous street-level culture – a teeming blend of cafes, sidewalk musicians, and small galleries and bistros, where it is hard to draw the line between participant and observer, or between creativity and its creators.

(Florida 2002, p. 166)

The Creative Class and Physical Culture

Highly educated and individualistic professionals (with relatively high levels of discretionary income, and a willingness to use it), interested in involvement in a wide range of PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES/EXPERIENCES as PARTICIPANTS as opposed to SPECTATORS.

Creative Class Activities:

- Climbing
- Running
- Working Out
- Snowboarding
- Road Cycling
- Mountain Cycling
- Kayaking
- Yoga

“creative” and ‘freelance qualities” (Banks, 2009, p. 674)

Downtown Spaces of [Commercial] Play
South Baltimore CrossFit: The Creative Class in Action?
Privatized Physical Activity
(Baltimore median household income: $30,078)

Annual Memberships

Merritt Athletic Club: $540-$1020

CrossFit Harbor East: $2200

Bikram Yoga Baltimore: $1200
Charm City Slackers

Slacklining:

“The art of balancing on a 1” or 2” wide piece of nylon webbing tensioned between two anchor points. The line is dynamic and stretches and bounces, which helps you improve your balance, focus, breath work, and core strength, and allows you to do a variety of tricks after you've mastered walking.”

(Charm City Slackers, 2013)
According to *Men’s Fitness* editor, Neil Boulton:

"Baltimore is a paragon of urban renewal. That's why it's the fittest city, that's why it's the comeback city”

In the words of then mayor, Martin O’Malley:

"You see some neighborhoods starting to grow again, and attracting younger people. With those younger people coming, there's a number of gyms now...In every growing neighborhood, you look for two leading signs — one is a gym and the other is a Starbucks."

“Perhaps the best that can be said about the creative-class idea is that it follows a real, if overhyped, phenomenon: the movement of young, largely single, childless and sometimes gay people into urban neighborhoods. This Soho-ization—the transformation of older, often industrial urban areas into hip enclaves—is evident in scores of cities.”

Redesigning the City as a “Playground” for the Creative Class?

Courting the Creative Class
Physical Culture and the *Suburban City*

Those living in relatively wealthy (for not all suburbs are) middle/upper class *SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES*, experience what is known as:

**PRIVILEGE AMPLIFICATION**

As a result of their levels of capital, and the advantages derived from living in an area with a *WELL-FUNDED* (through the tax base) local government and public services.

This is evident within *SUBURBAN* access to and experience of *PHYSICAL CULTURE/ACTIVITY*. 
Privatized Sport/Physical Culture Delivery

Welcome to Keith Van Eron Pro Soccer

Summer and School Year Soccer Camps
GoalKeeper Training
Indoor and Outdoor Leagues
Soccer classes starting at age 3

"Every young person who comes to my camp is very special to me. My number one goal is for each camper to have fun playing soccer and to feel good about themselves. If I can make the sport fun then the necessary work to become good will take care of itself. Even when I played professionally the sport, practice, the competitions were always fun. As a result I spent many hours on perfecting my skills. I like to think we teach more than soccer skills. I think one's attitude on the field is directly correlated to one's attitude in life. I want young people to never ever give up!"

- Keith Van Eron

Congratulations Keith! Keith was inducted into the Baltimore Blast Hall of Fame on February 16, 2008. For those that missed it and would like to hear what he said here is his speech.

Latest News

ADDRESS OF NEW INDOOR ARENA 336 CLUBHOUSE RD CORNER OF GILROY/BEAVER DAY

NEW INDOOR SUMMER KINDER KICKS CAMP IN AIR CONDITIONED INDOOR ARENA EVERY WEEK OF THE SUMMER AGES 3-6 ONLY HALF DAY 9:00am-12:30pm Cost: $120

DIRECTIONS TO THE NEW ARENA is North to Exit 18(Warren Rd) First light make a left on Eaver Dann Rd First light is Beaver Dann Rd make a left(This is Beaver Dann Rd again) First light on this rd make a right into Gilroy Rd First left on this road is CLUBHOUSE RD MAKE a LEFT INTO CLUBHOUSE 336 CLUBHOUSE
Neo-Liberal Swimming Culture

PRIVATIZED AND MARKET REGULATED PHYSICAL CULTURE PROVISION AND EXPERIENCE
Baltimore Country Club Culture
PRIVATE SCHOOLS are, by their very nature, privatized and commercial institutions.

Oftentimes, an important part of what you purchase through private schools is access to physical activity-related facilities, programs, and opportunities.
Indoor athletic facilities:
• Athletic arena (for basketball, volleyball, wrestling, and other indoor spectator sports)
• Utility gymnasium
• Auxiliary gymnasium
• Full-size, 25-meter swimming pool
• Weight room - newly renovated
• Locker rooms and laundry facilities (The Cage)
• Conference rooms
• Athletics Office Suite

Outdoor athletic facilities:
• Three game fields (for football, soccer, lacrosse, and other field sports)
• Olympic 400-meter track
• Nine tennis courts
• Six practice fields, including one with an all-weather artificial surface
• The Alpine Tower, a 40-foot climbing structure
• Ample athletic event parking (Some sports, such as ice hockey, golf, rowing, and squash, are held at off-campus locations.)
Both PARKS and PLAYGROUNDS (and indeed other public recreational spaces) are PRODUCTS and PRODUCERS of the ENVIRONMENTS in which they are LOCATED.

A Park is Never Just a Park

Public parks are potentially important public spaces where the populace can recreate, interact in safe and welcoming surroundings, and thereby strengthen community identity and involvement (social capital).

Conversely, where parks are poorly maintained, and/or become magnets for crime, the local community is unlikely to use them as a gathering place and source of social capital. Here, the park becomes a source of NEIGHBORHOOD BLIGHT rather than a NEIGHBORHOOD ATTRIBUTE.
The “Safe” Park

“A dynamic place where the design, maintenance, and policing of the park work together so that the general public perceives the park as a safe place, wants to go to the park regularly, and spends their optional time in the park engaged in valued activities. Crime and disorder is limited, and diverse usage of the park by different groups is tolerated. Legal activities are the dominant activities in the park. Because the local community values the park, it has a sense of “ownership” of it, and there are sufficient numbers of users who act as “natural guardians” to ensure informal social control. They also support formal interventions by park management and police when such interventions are necessary” (p. 5).

- Parents take children there
- Females go there as often as males
- Elderly people regularly visit the park
- Workers have lunch or take breaks there

The Archetypal **SUBURBAN PARK**

Location: Baltimore County  
Size: 96.2 acres  
Land Cost: $4.8 million  
Site Development Costs: $3.375 million  
Construction Began: Summer 2001  
Construction Completed: Fall 2002
Model Facilities
Meticulous Maintenance

Managed and Welcoming Environment
Mixed-Use (Population and Practices)
Concerted Cultivation as Cultural Norm

Class Habitus and Active Lifestyle Culture
Social Capital and Connectivity

Community Building:
Durable and Recognizable Social Networks
Physical Activity/Culture BASED SUBURBAN (middle/upper middle class):

PRIVILEGE AMPLIFICATION
Theme 5: Neoliberal Baltimore’s Under-Privileged Spaces (and Populations)
There has been the creation of a “fantasy city” (Hannigan, 1998), in which the Inner Harbor both presents an unreal perception of city life and shields both suburbanites and tourists from Baltimore’s continuing urban problems.

REDUCED TAX BASE
(depopulation and decline in industrial output)

+ 

REDIRECTION OF PUBLIC MONIES TO ENTREPRENEURIAL GOVERNANCE STRATEGIES
(capital investment in "tourist bubble" developments and corporate subsidies)

= 

SIGNIFICANT REDUCTION IN CITY'S OPERATING BUDGET, AND A RELATED REDUCTION (RETNRENCHMENT) IN PUBLIC SERVICES AND PROGRAMS
The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Education Services
Sanitation Services
Police Services
Library Services
Recreation Services
Fire Services

Reduction of Public Services and Spaces
The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Disinvestment and Decline in Public Services
The Entrepreneurial [Retrenchment] City

Disinvestment and Decline in Public Spaces
Social Disparities Within the Neoliberal City

Those with sufficiently **AFFLUENT** (creative classes/urban and suburban middle/upper classes) can avail themselves of **PRIVATIZED** services and programming (health/education/recreation).

However, the most economically **VULNERABLE** populations (the urban lower classes) were left underserved by the **NEOLIBERAL RETRENCHMENT IN PUBLIC** services and programming.
The “Rot Beneath the Glitter” (Harvey, 2001)

The image of the Inner Harbor draws attention away from the very real social problems that continue to plague Baltimore, and that have not been addressed by the URBAN ENTREPRENEURIAL redevelopment of the city’s COMMERCIAL CORE.

These lingering problems include:

- UNEMPLOYMENT
- POVERTY
- EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
- DRUG USE
- CRIME
- HEALTH

Faultines: Baltimore - Anatomy of a City
"A third-world city in the first world"

Baltimore Life Expectancy (at time of birth) and Select National Averages

United States (78.2)

Uzbekistan (70.2)

Honduras (71.0)

Iran (73.0)

China (76.2)

Mexico (76.2)

Bangladesh (64.1)

World Average (67.2)
Physical Culture and the *Underclass City*

“Deprivation Amplification”

“a pattern of diminished opportunities related to the features of the local environment. In places where people have fewer personal resources, the local facilities that enable people to lead healthy lives are poorer than in areas that are not impoverished and socially deprived (p. S55).”

Within the ENTREPRENEURIAL [RETRENCHMENT] CITY, there has been a marked DISINVESTMENT and DECLINE in PHYSICAL ACTIVITY-RELATED PUBLIC SERVICES, PROGRAMS, and SPACES.
Effects of Cuts in Recreation and Parks
1993-2010 budget:

- Reduction in staff numbers
- Increase in activity fees
- Decline in organized football and baseball leagues
- Field and facility poorly maintained
- Playgrounds (80%) unsafe
- One maintenance worker for every 101 acres

The “Risky” Park

“A place where crime and disorder has become the norm to the degree that local users consider the park unsafe, try to avoid being in the park, and limit their time in the park to necessary activities. Crime and public disorder such as vandalism, littering, dog fouling, alcohol and drug abuse, and public sex have become the dominant activities in the park.” (p. 6)

- People go through the park as quickly as possible
- Drunken people hang out there
- Young males dominate the setting
- It is littered with syringes and beer bottles
- Younger children don’t play there.

Unwelcoming and Unsafe (Underused) PUBLIC SPACES I
Decades of Decline and Disinvestment

From the early 1990s, public provision for recreation in Baltimore city has been in steady decline due to increased budget pressures:

1993: 143 Recreation Centers

2010: 55 Recreation Centers

2013: 31 Recreation Centers
The Neoliberalizing Recreation Center?

1993:
143 Recreation Centers

2010:
55 Recreation Centers

2012:
11 “Community” Centers
44 out for private tender
Baltimore City Recreation Centers 2010

The Model “Community” Center
(for every 50,000 of population)
City gets few bids to run rec centers
Programs could close, mayoral aide says

The exterior of the Hilton Recreation Center on Wednesday. Baltimore has received bids to run only seven of the 31 recreation centers that officials hope to hand over to third parties by the end of the year; the dearth of applications raises the prospect that some will be forced to close. (Karl Merton Ferron / The Baltimore Sun / October 12, 2011)
Public Concerns Over Recreation Center Plan
[Illegal] Baltimore Dirt Bike Subculture
The Twelve O’Clock Boys

See Video Clip 7
An Urban Subculture of Recreation and Protest

“The riders, converging from all parts of the inner city, regard their practice both as a recreation and a protest. The dirt bike culture of Baltimore is a primal and energetic response to the tension between social classes. When the riders embark on the city, they suddenly have a platform. It plays on the delicacy of their lives as they know it from their marginalized communities.”

“This is our tradition, our culture, this is what we do. Ain’t no one going to take it from us. This is our release.”

“It’s a fucked up situation within the city. We’re trying to change that the best way we know how.”
“They’re closing all the recs, they’re closing all the rec centers, so what’s a child to do. Tell me something new.”
The Police Response

Physical Activity/Culture
BASED URBAN (under/lower class):

DEPRIVATION AMPLIFICATION
Interestingly…

The Baltimore Orioles and Ravens, having received considerable public subsidies for the building of their new stadia, refused a $1 tax on every ticket that would have gone to funding parks and recreation (and hence physical activity) in the city. As such, they both:

“balked at a direct subsidy to [public] recreation” (p. 233).

A Wavering Belief in Entrepreneurial City Governance?

“Our recreation centers keep kids safe, healthy and off the streets, and it's our responsibility to protect the interests of our children and our communities. What does it say about our priorities as a city when we will move heaven and Earth to continue a street race but will turn our backs on our most vulnerable citizens?...

...Ultimately, city government needs to dedicate its attention to things like retaining and expanding recreation centers for our children and seniors, and to operating swimming pools during the summer for our youths on a full-time basis. We should focus more of our attention toward our neighborhoods and work to improve the everyday lives of our citizens.

City officials, including myself, supported the Baltimore Grand Prix because we believed the race would have a positive impact on our city. But the time has come for us to instead focus on core issues that impact the quality of life for all Baltimoreans.”

William B. Marker, a Baltimore lawyer and community activist who sued unsuccessfully for a referendum on the stadium bills:

“What if that money [the public funds spent on Orioles Park] had been spent on schools and drug treatment?...Who knows what would have been.”

Three Baltimore Physical Cultures

See course website for related lectures slides, podcast, thematic review questions, video clips, required readings, key concepts, discussion tasks, and essay question.